



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,251	09/23/1999	CATHERINE M. KEENE	A0653-1160	4434

7590 09/20/2006

DAVID R. STEVENS
STEVENS & WESTBERG, LLP
99 NORTH FIRST STREET
SUITE 201
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/401,251

Applicant(s)

KEENE ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG Q. PHAM

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/22/06 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Terminal Disclaimer

A terminal disclaimer was filed on 06/22/06. The filing of terminal disclaimer is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants:

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for not complying with the written description requirement. In particular, the examiner points to several occurrences of the language "a version of an object" and "a version of the object", and that the use of these phrases in connection with access privileges or access criteria. In response, the claims have been amended to clarify the proper usage of the versions of the objects, thus obviating the rejection.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 has been amended, however, the claimed limitation, *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object*, was not described in the specification as

Art Unit: 2168

indicated in the previous Office Action. The applicants fail to direct the examiner's attention to the page and line that disclosed these features. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is sustained.

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 7 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the amendment of claims 7 and 13-16 and the new ground of the rejection.

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the amendment of claims and the new ground of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: *a object request* at line 8 (*an object request* is respectfully suggested), *a user* at line 14 (*the user* is respectfully suggested).

Appropriate correction is required.

Duplicate Claims, Warning

Applicant is advised that should claim 15 be found allowable, claim 16 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The system as recited in claim 1 does not produce a useful and tangible result as set forth in MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii)¹. The system does not produce a tangible result because the claimed limitation, for allowing controlled access to modify individual groups of data contained within the version of the object and that may be viewed by a user according to the user's predetermined modification

¹ MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii):

For such subject matter to be statutory, the claimed process must be limited to a practical application of the abstract idea or mathematical algorithm in the technological arts. See *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1543, 31 USPQ2d at 1556-57 (quoting *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 192, 209 USPQ at 10). See also *Alappat* 33 F.3d at 1569, 31 USPQ2d at 1578-79 (Newman, J., concurring) ("unpatentability of the principle does not defeat patentability of its practical applications") (citing *O'Reilly v. Morse*, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 114-19). A claim is limited to a practical application when the method, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the method recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. See *AT & T*, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. Likewise, a machine claim is statutory when the machine, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result (as in *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601) and/or when a specific machine is being claimed (as in *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557 ("*en banc*"). For example, a computer process that simply calculates a mathematical algorithm that models noise is nonstatutory. However, a claimed process for digitally filtering noise employing the mathematical algorithm is statutory.

Art Unit: 2168

privileges, is an intended use limitation². This intended use limitation is not given weight because it simply expresses the intended result in response to the access criteria associated with the groups of data. The system does not produce a useful result because controlling access to *other associated information of a file* as recited in the preamble is still unknown. As recited in claim 1, only *the version of the object* is controlled access.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 7 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

² MPEP 2111.04:

- (A) "adapted to " or "adapted for " clauses;
- (B) "wherein " clauses; and
- (C) "whereby " clauses.

The determination of whether each of these clauses is a limitation in a claim depends on the specific facts of the case. In *Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp.*, 405 F.3d 1326, 1329, 74 USPQ2d 1481, 1483 (Fed. Cir. 2005), the court held that when a "whereby" clause states a condition that is material to patentability, it cannot be ignored in order to change the substance of the invention." *Id.* However, the court noted (quoting *Minton v. Nat 'l Ass'n of Securities Dealers, Inc.*, 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003)) that a "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." *Id.*<

Examiner respectfully suggests applicants replacing the "for" clause by a positive statement that discloses the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claim 1, the claimed limitation, *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object*, was not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 7, the claimed limitation, *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within the version of the redacted object transferred*, was not described in the specification.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the claimed limitation, *establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user*, was not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 15, the claimed limitations, *establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user and setting up a redacted version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges*, were not described in the specification.

Regarding claim 16, the claimed limitation, *establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access permitted to a user of a version of an object... receiving an object request by a user via a network for access to a version of an object... setting up a version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges*, was not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1,

the claimed limitation at line 9, *the operation of the application server*, references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced;

the claimed limitation at line 12, *the application code*, references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced;

the claimed limitation at line 12, *the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object*, references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced.

Regarding claim 2,

the claimed limitations, *the ability of a user*, *the transferred redacted version* and *the requested object*, reference to other items in the claims. It is unclear what items are being referenced;

the claim limitation, *the user*, references to a plurality of users in the claims. It is unclear what "user" is being referenced.

Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claims 3-5, the claimed limitations, *the ability, the redacted version and the requested object*, reference to other items in the claims. It is unclear what items are being referenced.

Regarding claim 6,
the claimed limitations, *the access, the redacted version, the product chain, the transferred redacted version of the object*, reference to other items in the claims. It is unclear what items are being referenced;

the claim limitation, *the object*, references to a plurality of objects in the claims. It is unclear what "object" is being referenced.

Regarding claim 7,
the claimed limitation, *the database, the CPU, the transferred version of the object, the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within the version of the redacted object transferred*, reference to other items in the claims. It is unclear what items are being referenced;

the claimed limitation, *the object* at line 9, references to a plurality of objects in the claims. It is unclear what "object" is being referenced;

the claimed limitation, *the redacted version of the object*, references to a plurality of "redacted version of an object" in the claim. It is unclear what "redacted version of an object" is being referenced.

Regarding claim 8, the claimed limitation, *the redacted version of the object*, references to a plurality of "redacted version of an object" in the claims. It is unclear what "redacted version of an object" is being referenced.

Regarding claim 11, the claimed limitation, *the version of the object*, references to other items in the claims. It is unclear what item is being referenced.

Regarding claim 12, the claimed limitation, *the requestor*, references to other items in the claims. It is unclear what item is being referenced.

Regarding claim 15, the claimed limitation, *transmitting the redacted version of the requested object... in which a user has privileges of access*, makes the claim indefinite because a request is received from *a requestor*, and the requested object is transmitted to *a user*.

Regarding claim 16,
the claimed limitation, *the privileged user*, references to other items in the claims. It is unclear what item is being referenced;

the claim limitation, *the user*, references to a plurality of users in the claim. It is unclear what "user" is being referenced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneck et al. [USP 6,314,409 B2] .

Regarding claim 1, Schneck teaches *a system for providing the transfer of and the controlled access to a version of an object and other associated information of a file by a plurality of users comprising* (Abstract and Col. 17, Lines 53-64):

a database for storing an object and associated information, the object comprising distinguishable groups of data (a book, a movie, software program or a legal document is considered as *an object and associated information* (Col. 33, Line 16-Col. 34, Line 18). The digital object is stored in data structure or database as in FIG. 21b. In term of a legal document, a plurality of paragraphs of legal document 224 is considered as *distinguishable groups of data*),

each group of data having associated access criteria for access to the groups of data (FIG. 21a, Col. 33, Lines 66-67; Col. 25, Lines 15-55, in term of a legal document, a plurality of paragraphs of legal document 224 *having associated access criteria for access to the groups of data*);

Art Unit: 2168

an application server configured to control access to data stored in the database and to set up and send a document file having a representation of an object and associated documents that are stored in the database

(Col. 9, Line 59-Col. 10, Line 13);

a memory for storing software code for controlling the operation of the application server (Col. 10, Lines 31-39 and Col. 15, Lines 41-49);

access data application code stored in the memory and executable by the application server (Col. 15, Lines 41-49),

the application code being responsive to the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within a version of an object and to predetermined modification privileges for allowing controlled access to modify individual groups of data contained within the version of the object and that may be viewed by a user according to the user's predetermined modification privileges (Col. 25, Lines 6-58 and Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7).

Regarding claim 2, Schneck teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Schneck further discloses *the access data application code enables the ability of a user to read the contents of the transferred redacted version of the requested object that was sent by the application server according to access privileges associated with the user* (Col. 25, Lines 6-58 and Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7).

Regarding claim 3, Schneck teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 2, Schneck further discloses *the access data application code includes the ability to modify the contents of the version of the requested object* (Col. 26, Lines 30-31).

Regarding claim 4, Schneck teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Schneck further discloses *the ability to modify includes the ability to delete information contained in the version of the requested object* (Col. 26, Lines 30-31).

Regarding claim 5, Schneck teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Schneck further discloses *the ability to modify includes the ability to add data to the version of the requested object* (Col. 26, Lines 30-31).

Regarding claim 7, Schneck teaches *a method of controlling access to objects stored in electronic form* (Abstract), comprising:

storing an object, the object comprising distinguishable groups of data (a book, a movie, software program or a legal document is considered as *an object* (Col. 33, Line 16-Col. 34, Line 18). The digital object is stored in data structure as in FIG. 21b. In term of a legal document, a plurality of paragraphs of legal document 224 is considered as *distinguishable groups of data*),

each group of data having associated access criteria for access to the groups of data (In term of a legal document, different portions, e.g., paragraphs, of the document have different access criteria (Schneck, Col. 25, Lines 52-58), e.g., number of read accesses, size of read access, intensity of access... (Schneck, Col. 25, Lines 32-50), and the purpose is *for access to the groups of data*, e.g., a user is allowed to access certain data a specified number of time... (Schneck, Col. 31-Lines 1-9));

controlling the access to the database using an application server (Col. 9, Line 59-Col. 10, Line 13) *configured to set up a redacted version of an object according to access criteria established for a user* (Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7);

storing software code for controlling the operation of the CPU in memory (Col. 15, Lines 45-49);

transferring a redacted version of an object to a user in the form of a document file having the redacted version of the object and any associated documents requested by a user contained therein (Col. 33, Line 10-Col. 34, Line 7); and

allowing controlled access to individual groups of data contained within the transferred version of the object by an individual user according to an individual user's predetermined privileges in response to the access criteria associated with the groups of data contained within the version of the redacted object transferred (Col. 25, Lines 15-58).

Regarding claim 8, Schneck teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Schneck further discloses the step of *receiving an object request by a requestor* (Col. 17, Lines 45-52); *verifying the requestor's user privilege access criteria* (Col. 18, Lines 47-48); *and transmitting a redacted version of an object configured to reveal information contained within the redacted version of the object according to the requestor's user privilege access criteria* (Col. 33, Line 6-Col. 34, Line 7).

Regarding claim 9, Schneck teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Schneck further discloses the step of *establishing a version of an object by loading information into the version of the object into separate groups having separate access privilege criteria* (FIG. 21a, Col. 33, Lines 66-67; Col. 25, Lines 15-55).

Regarding claim 12, Schneck teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 7, Schneck further discloses the step of *transmitting a redacted version of an object by sending an electronic object to the requestor that contains the groups of information to which the requestor has access to and that excludes groups of information associated with an object that is redacted so that the requestor has limited access* (Col. 33, Line 6-Col. 34, Line 7).

Regarding claims 13 and 14, Schneck teaches *a computer program product for use with a computer system, a central processing unit and means coupled to the central processing unit for storing a database to automatically manage objects for viewing and marking an object having varying formats without the use of any originating application of a file to view the object* (Abstract), comprising:

computer readable code means for establishing an object in a storage location (Col. 33, Line 16-Col. 34, Line 18, a book, a movie, software program or a legal document as disclosed is considered as an object, a storage location is an inherited feature of a digital document);

computer readable code means for identifying a user to have limited access to information associated with the object (Col. 15, Lines 30-35);

computer readable code means for establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user (Col. 25, Lines 15-58);

computer readable code means for receiving an object request by a requestor (Col. 17, Lines 45-52);

computer readable code means for verifying the requestor's user privilege access criteria (Col. 18, Lines 47-48); and

computer readable code means for transmitting a redacted version of the requested object in the form of a redacted document that masks information according to the requestor's user privilege access criteria (Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Schneck teaches *a computer server having a database for storing data pertaining to product information, a method of securely transferring data between a source and an access destination* (Abstract) comprising:

establishing an object in a storage location (Col. 33, Line 16-Col. 34, Line 18, a book, a movie, software program or a legal document as disclosed is considered as an object, a storage location is an inherited feature of a digital document);

Art Unit: 2168

identifying a user to have limited access to the object (Col. 15, Lines 30-35);

establishing privilege access criteria that define the scope of access of a version of the object for the user
(Col. 25, Lines 15-58);

receiving a object request by a requestor (Col. 17, Lines 45-52);

verifying the requestor's user privilege access criteria (Col. 18, Lines 47-48);

setting up a redacted version of an object and associated documents according to user access privileges for transmission to the user; and transmitting the redacted version of the requested object, wherein the access criteria defines the information in which a user has privileges of access to the redacted version of the requested object (Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2168

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et al. [USP 6,314,409 B2] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mukherjee et al. [USP 5,317,729].

Regarding claim 6, Schneck teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Schneck further discloses *the transferred version of the object is configured to reveal limited information according to a guest user's predetermined access privileges* (Col. 33, Line 66-Col. 34, Line 7).

The missing of Schneck is the claimed limitation *the access to the version of the object is determined by a business relationship to produce products and defined by the host according to the need of information in the product chain.*

Mukherjee teaches *the access to the version of the object is determined by a business relationship to produce products and defined by the host according to the need of information in the product chain* (FIG. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply access control technique to a business relationship in a product chain in order to control BOM document.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et al. [USP 6,314,409 B2] as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Hayes et al. [WO 95/14266].

Regarding claim 11, Schneck teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 8, Schneck further discloses the step of *verifying the requestor's user identification and identifying the groups of data within the version of the object to which the requestor has access* (Col. 18, Lines 56-58 and Col. 24, Lines 52-65). The missing of Schneck is the step of *extracting the requestor's user identification from the object request.*

Art Unit: 2168

Hayes teaches the steps of *extracting the requestor's user identification from the object request* (Hayes, FIG. 1).

By applying the technique *extracting the user's user identification from the object request* as taught by Hayes, the processing time of verifying user name and password will be improved significantly.


Art Unit: 2168

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


HUNG Q PHAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

September 12, 2006